

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK**

---

**UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,**

**15-CR-98G**

**-v-**

**AUGUSTUS KIDD,**

**Defendant.**

---

**DECISION AND ORDER**

This case was referred to the undersigned by the Hon. Frank P. Geraci, Jr., in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1), for all pretrial matters and to hear and report on dispositive motions.

**PRELIMINARY STATEMENT**

The defendant, Augustus Kidd (“the defendant”), is charged, along with a number of co-defendants, with having violated Title 21 U.S.C. § 846 (Count 1). Dkt. #1. He has filed a motion wherein he seeks “permission to join motions filed co-counsel along with the right to supplement those motions according to issues which may arise during the discovery phase and consistent with the government’s ongoing investigation.” Dkt. #154.

This application on behalf of the defendant is granted with the further directive and finding that the decision made by this Court as to each co-defendant’s

requests contained in their motion in which the defendant joins shall be deemed to be the finding and order of this Court as to the defendant herein.

It is hereby **ORDERED** pursuant to 28 U.S.C § 636(b)(1) that:

This Decision and Order be filed with the Clerk of Court.

**ANY OBJECTIONS** to this Decision and Order must be filed with the Clerk of this Court within fourteen (14) days after receipt of a copy of this Decision and Order in accordance with the above statute, Fed.R.Crim.P. 58(g)(s) and Local Rule 58.2.

The district judge will ordinarily refuse to consider *de novo*, arguments, case law and/or evidentiary material which could have been, but were not presented to the magistrate judge in the first instance. See, e.g., *Patterson-Leitch Co., Inc. v. Massachusetts Municipal Wholesale Electric Co.*, 840 F.2d 985 (1st Cir. 1988). **Failure to file objections within the specified time or to request an extension of such time waives the right to appeal the District Judge's Order.** *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140 (1985); *Wesolek, et al. v. Canadair Ltd., et al.*, 838 F.2d 55 (2d Cir. 1988).

The parties are reminded that, pursuant to Rule 58.2 of the Local Rules for the Western District of New York, "written objections shall specifically identify the portions of the proposed findings and recommendations to which objection is made and

the basis for such objection and shall be supported by legal authority." **Failure to comply with the provisions of Rule 58.2, or with the similar provisions of Rule 58.2 (concerning objections to a Magistrate Judge's Decision and Order), may result in the District Judge's refusal to consider the objection.**

DATED: November 16, 2017  
Buffalo, New York

**S/ H. Kenneth Schroeder, Jr.**  
**H. KENNETH SCHROEDER, JR.**  
**United States Magistrate Judge**